Case.	1.17-md-02004-DAF D00#. 2131 Filed. 00/00/13 1 0/20. FageID #. 2002/7	
1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO	
2	EASTERN DIVISION	
3	IN RE: NATIONAL)	
4	PRESCRIPTION) OPIATE LITIGATION,) Judge Polster	
5) Cleveland, Ohio Plaintiffs,)	
6) Civil Action	
7) Number 1:17MD02804)	
8	APPLIES TO ALL CASES)	
9		
10		
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HAD BEFORE	
12	THE HONORABLE DAN AARON POLSTER	
13	JUDGE OF SAID COURT,	
14	ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 2019	
15		
16		
17	Official Court Reporter: Shirle M. Perkins, RDR, CRR U.S. District Court	
18	801 West Superior, #7-189	
19	Cleveland, OH 44113-1829 (216) 357-7106	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.	
25		

Ouse.		75/50/13 2 0/ 20. 1 agolb //. 2002/6	2
1	APPEARANCES:		
2	For the Plaintiffs:	PETER WEINBERGER, ESQ.,	
3		Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber Suite 1700	
4		1001 Lakeside Avenue, E Cleveland, OH 44114	
5		(216) 696–3232	
6			
7	For Derric and Ceonda Rees:	SCOTT BICKFORD, ESQ., Martzell & Bickford	
8		338 Lafayette Street New Orleans, LA 70130	
9		(504) 581-9065	
10	For Jodi Shaffer:	MARC DANN, ESQ.,	
11	TOT GOAT SHATTET.	Dann Law P.O. Box 6031040	
12		Cleveland, OH 44103 (216) 373-0539	
13	Also Present:	THOMAS BILLAK, ESQ.,	
14	ALSO TIESEILE.	KEVIN THOMPSON, ESQ., MARK DANN, ESQ.,	
15		,,	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

WEDNESDAY SESSION, AUGUST 7, 2019, AT 9:22 A.M.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone.

This is a hearing on the NAS class action case or cases.

These cases, of course, are dramatically different from the other cases in the MDL. It's not clear to me they really belong here, but they were transferred to this Court. So I have them. And I need to decide how to -- how to proceed.

I requested the parties propose a schedule for dealing with the motion for class certification. I had assumed that it would be a fairly quick process, but the schedule the parties have proposed lasts more than a year, which is not anything I contemplated and not anything I planned to do.

I've got to decide very quickly whether these cases, one, whether they're appropriate for class certification. I obviously have some serious questions. And two, if they belong in the MDL. And I've got to make that decision quickly and I intend to do it.

So I need to determine from the parties what -- what you need to tee up this motion for class certification. To me, it's a mixed question of fact and law. The Plaintiffs have to demonstrate, indicate how they hope to prove their contentions, but -- and more significantly, how common

09:43:43 5

09:44:07 10

09:44:30 15

09:44:51 20

09:45:15 25

issues of fact substantially predominate over individual questions. And these cases are totally unlike anything else in the MDL. The cases in the MDL almost exclusively are brought by Government entities, states, cities, counties, seeking injunctive relief and monetary damages for public services that had been expended in the past and will be expended in the future.

The Plaintiffs have very specifically disclaimed any intent to focus on any individual who's been harmed; addicted, overdosed, injured, died, whatever.

They're not going to try to prove their cases through proof of any individual injury. They're doing it through aggregate proof. And again, they're not — they're not focusing on any individuals because that isn't the injury and that's not the harm.

Of course, this -- this class action is the opposite. It's made up of individual claims for individuals who are born with Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome and require medical monitoring; in some cases, very expensive medical treatment for many years.

So these are individual claims. So they've been lumped together in a class action. The Court has great doubt as to whether they're appropriate for class action, and I need to address that quickly.

Now, can the Plaintiffs tell me what discovery they

09:46:06 10

13 14

12

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

9

09:45:39 5

09:46:30 15

16

17 18

19

09:46:53 20

21

22

23

24

09:47:09 25

1 need to address that question? Really, whether individual, 2. individual questions, both on liability and damages, 3 predominate? If so, it can't be a class, and it's got to be brought as individual cases, and it won't be in this MDL. 4 09:47:30 5 If so, maybe it can be brought as a class. Whether it stays 6 in the MDL is between me and the JPML. 7 So you're talking about months and months of 8 discovery, expert reports. I don't understand why you need months of discovery. I don't understand why you need any 9 09:47:48 10 expert reports. So someone needs to educate me. 11 MR. BICKFORD: Good morning, Judge. Scott 12 Bickford representing the NAS babies. Judge, in order for us to -- well, first of all, we're 13 14 asking for medical surveillance monitoring class, first of 09:48:07 15 all. So it depends what the ask in this case is. And first 16 and foremost would be a medical surveillance and monitoring 17 class, which is to avoid or minimize the eventual damage or 18 to abate the damage that children have. 19 It's -- the NAS babies, as this Court knows, is a 09:48:30 20 unique class of individuals. They are, by definition, 21 babies that are born with Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome, 22 Number 1. So they have, unlike most medical monitoring 23 cases, they have a pre-existing injury. It is not a 24 speculative or future injury. And the necessity of medical 09:48:56 25 monitoring of these children is to monitor what

manifestations of the existing injury take place in the 1 2. future. Those manifestations are fairly documented. I 3 think they're pretty --4 THE COURT: They're going to be different for 09:49:15 5 each child. For some, happily, it won't be much; for some, 6 they may have permanent -- permanent injuries. 7 MR. BICKFORD: Hence, the medical monitoring issue because what we want to do is to track -- to register 8 9 these children, to track these children, to see -- to track 09:49:37 10 the 40 percent -- the odd 40 percent of these children that 11 develop mental disabilities, learning disabilities. 12 THE COURT: Again, this is all individual --13 that's the point. It's all individual. And the other issue 14 is proof of causation. All right? I don't see how -- I mean each -- each individual was 09:49:56 15 16 born to a mother. The mother obviously ingested opioids at 17 some point during the pregnancy. We know that. That's the 18 only way you get Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome. Okay? 19 How and when and whose opioids each mother ingested is different for each -- for each mother. Some of them may 09:50:25 20 21 have ingested prescription opioids, some may have ingested 22 street drugs, some of them may have started on prescription 23 opioids and gone to street drugs, some may not. 2.4 different for each individual mother. Okay? 09:50:43 25 So what I've got to -- and no amount of discovery is

1	going to change that. I know that, you know that. All
2	right? You've got to tell me succinctly how you plan to
3	prove your case and how and how it is appropriate for a
4	class action. I'm not sure you need any discovery for that
09:51:03 5	and you certainly don't need an expert. You've got to tell
6	me and convince me of that in order to get class
7	certification. If you do, I'll certify a class. If you
8	don't, I won't, and you'll have to bring individual cases.
9	So I need I don't think you need a year. If you
09:51:19 10	need a year, you're not going to get it. So tell me I
11	mean I don't know what discovery you need to answer those
12	questions. If you need discovery, I'll allow a short period
13	of time for discovery.
14	MR. BICKFORD: Well, presently, the question
09:51:40 15	is, is the is the class certification that we seek a
16	class certification against the distributors in a divergent
17	market or do we seek it against just, for instance, Purdue
18	for those mothers that basically ingested a Purdue product
19	in the market? So it depends on what
09:52:06 20	THE COURT: How are you I mean
21	MR. BICKFORD: How we define the class
22	THE COURT: You've got to do that. I'm not
23	going
24	MR. BICKFORD: I understand that, Judge.
09:52:13 25	THE COURT: I'm not going to give you a year

to figure that out.

2.

09:53:59 25

09:53:39 20

09:53:17 15

09:52:29 5

09:52:54 10

MR. BICKFORD: No. And what we asked for was a very short reasonable time to amend complaints, which was within 30 days, and 50 days thereafter to file our class cert motion, together with our Defendant, with our expert reports, justifying the reasonable and necessary extent of the medical monitoring in this particular case.

At that point, there was a -- and we needed that four months to look at the discovery that's already been done in this case to surmount certain defenses that arise that the Court has somewhat alluded to but there are other defenses that arise in this case that may be surmounted due to the Defendant's marketing procedures which had been extensively looked at by the PEC. And there may be some additional issues of what actual physical warnings on the NAS issue were issued by the pharmaceutical industry as a whole.

So those are the principle issues that we need to look at in forming our class cert motion that would go before the Court; at which point, we would tender our experts, we would tender the -- to the Defendants and they would have a short discovery period to produce experts to the contrary, and the Court would have briefs on the issue and then decide on whether or not it decides to have a hearing on the issue.

So that's the -- that was the plan. I think that originally, we had looked at a plan that ended in February

1 because of the holidays in November and December and the 2. timing of that issue. That was pushed out to what the 3 present plan is. 4 We've discussed the issue with the Defendants today. 09:54:21 5 We're willing to rework the schedule, understanding that the 6 Court wants to resolve this more quickly and are prepared to 7 propose a separate schedule tomorrow to the Court on the -a revised schedule tomorrow to the Court. 8 9 THE COURT: I --09:54:39 10 MR. BILLAK: Your Honor, if I might interrupt. 11 I'm Tom Billak, and we're also one of the people that 12 represents some of the children here. 13 I think, your Honor, you're right. You have hit the 14 nail on the head. The discovery that we need has nothing to 09:54:58 15 do with the theory of the class certification towards the 16 market, and so we --17 THE COURT: Well, it may. I mean I still 18 don't -- I'm going to have to know -- you're going to have 19 to explain to me how you're going to prove your case because 09:55:15 20 that may -- that very well may influence the class cert 21 issue. 22 MR. BILLAK: So we --23 THE COURT: And who's against --24 MR. BILLAK: Plaintiffs have put that on how

we intend to prove that. And so what we say is that by this

09:55:27 25

1 oversupplying of the market, particularly like in West 2. Virginia, Ohio, and in Pennsylvania, they have flooded and 3 created this market. And they work together in concert to 4 create this market. So if you contributed to that market, 09:55:47 5 then you're liable for it all. And the point is in some of 6 these states, the law is extremely surprising and very 7 favorable on both. THE COURT: Well, that's another -- it may be 8 9 true in some states, but that -- that's the reason why there 09:56:04 10 shouldn't be any nationwide class action. You want to bring 11 a case in a particular state, so fine. 12 MR. BILLAK: I think that the issue of --13 you're right, your Honor, many states, it is very 14 problematic on whether you could do a class. 09:56:21 15 Number 2, the nationwide class, I would think the only 16 thing that we could probably do is what Ms. Cabraser was 17 arguing, for was some type of negotiating class. 18 THE COURT: Well, no, you're not in any 19 negotiated class. That had to do with cities and counties. 09:56:38 20 Okay? 21 MR. BILLAK: But, that would be the only 22 thing. I don't think --23 THE COURT: Well, let's start -- why don't you 24 withdraw this -- why don't you withdraw this, go back to the 09:56:46 25 drawing board, decide what you want to do. If you want to

1 bring some cases in State Court, you know, where you think 2. the law covers this, I -- you can do it. I -- I don't 3 think -- I have great doubts whether this is a viable 4 nationwide class action. Okay? But, you can -- you want to 09:57:09 5 try and convince me, you can, but I -- you're not doing a 6 very good job so far. 7 MR. BICKFORD: Judge, the Court's order that 8 we're following at this point anticipated that we would file three individual State Court class actions and a nationwide 9 09:57:26 10 class action, which is what we have intended to do. And so 11 we're following that dictate. We would propose those to the 12 Court. Now, remember that medical -- and the Court looks at 13 14 the umbrella of --THE COURT: First of all, I don't have any 09:57:46 15 16 state cases. You want to file something in State Court, you 17 file it in State Court. 18 MR. BILLAK: Well, your Honor, we're in 19 Federal Court because the tort reform that was passed, I 09:58:03 20 quess it was like in the late 90's, required the class 21 action cert filed in state -- if they involved a number of 22 Plaintiffs, have to be filed in federal court. 23 MR. BICKFORD: The Fair Act brings us here. 24 MR. BILLAK: And so the point is we're in 09:58:18 25 Federal Court, and we filed in this Federal Court like, for

1 example, Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and then the panel 2. sent us all here. And --3 THE COURT: Well, I could send it back real 4 fast. And maybe I'll just do that. Okay? I -- this is not 09:58:36 5 growing -- I don't think this is a good productive use of my 6 resources. 7 So maybe I'll just shoot them back. They can go back 8 to around the country. I think these are unworkable cases, 9 unmanageable cases. I don't understand them. If you can't 09:58:54 10 succinctly explain it to me, I think this -- the quick thing 11 is I'll just send them back to the JPML and let them do what 12 they want. 13 Judge, can I take a short swing at MR. DANN: 14 this? 09:59:04 15 THE COURT: Very short. 16 MR. DANN: Yes, your Honor. My name is Mark 17 Dann on behalf of the children, NAS-affected children. 18 Your Honor, the establishment of a medical monitoring 19 protocol by injunction on a nationwide basis or on a 09:59:23 20 state-by-state basis, depending on the outcome of your 21 evaluation of the case law, is actually a relatively simple 22 and quick solution. These children are getting older 23 everyday, and the ability to --24 THE COURT: I understand that, Mark, but I 09:59:40 25 don't see how you're going to -- how you're going to -- how

1 you're going to track the harm from Baby A to any one 2. Defendant unless you can categorically show that, you know, 3 that while -- while she was pregnant, that baby's mother 4 took a drug from a, you know, a particular manufacturer. 10:00:06 5 MR. DANN: Your Honor, our challenge is no 6 more challenging than the challenge of the cities and 7 counties. THE COURT: No, they've got -- they can do it 8 9 in an aggregate way. I don't see how you do it. 10:00:16 10 MR. DANN: I think we could present that

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

10:01:03 25

10:00:46 20

10:00:29 15

MR. DANN: I think we could present that evidence in an aggregate way that would allow the Court to establish clear monitoring standards so that these -- these children can get the interventions that they need.

Many of these children are in foster care right now. They're without parents with the resources to have the psychologists and the special education evaluations and the things that need to be done to make sure that they get the resources they need. And the injunctive part of this is, I think we're all in agreement, is literally the only part of this of these cases that could be -- would lend themselves to class treatment and could potentially lend themselves to national treatment as it relates to just establishing protocols and establishing the mechanism for funding, a medical monitoring fund that will allow these children to receive those services.

1 It could be a very important --2. THE COURT: That's only part of the case. Т 3 mean you've got -- your case encompasses a whole lot of 4 other things. All right? 10:01:16 5 MR. DANN: We could skinny this down --6 THE COURT: I suggest you go back to the 7 drawing board and figure out what you want to do and how you 8 want to do it and where you want to file it. All right? 9 Because what you've got, I don't think is manageable, 10:01:32 10 workable in this court or maybe any other court. 11 So that's my suggestion. 12 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, may I -- I'm Kevin 13 Thompson from West Virginia. And I'd just like to answer 14 your --10:01:48 15 THE COURT: I'm very sympathetic to these 16 children. That isn't -- I mean obviously, you know, through 17 no fault of their own, they were born, you know, addicted. 18 All right? I mean it's horrendous, but how -- how you deal 19 with it in a lawsuit is, you know, that's what you've got to 10:02:04 20 convince me or any court. 21 MR. THOMPSON: Well, your Honor --22 THE COURT: What you have -- what you have 23 isn't going to cut it. MR. THOMPSON: Well, your Honor, medical 24 10:02:14 25 monitoring, by its very nature, is not an individual issue,

1	
1	the cause. The most important part of it is the
2	epidemiology and the fact that you're going to help a
3	community. The
4	THE COURT: Wait a minute. But you've got to
10:02:30 5	prove it as to any individual defendant, the causation and
6	the liability. All right.
7	MR. THOMPSON: I don't think so, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Well, I do. I do.
9	MR. THOMPSON: Because we're selling
10:02:42 10	THE COURT: You're going to have to convince
11	me or any Judge that you can to get a class. Obviously, you
12	need an individual to bring an individual case.
13	MR. THOMPSON: The ATSDR provides
14	THE COURT: Look, I didn't want to argue the
10:02:57 15	case. I mean I I was hoping to have a fairly simple,
16	short process. It isn't happening.
17	So I suggest you all go back I'm doing nothing.
18	You go back to the drawing board, come up with some a new
19	case or cases. If you think there's a class action case
10:03:14 20	that should be brought, bring it. I'll look at it.
21	MR. DANN: Your Honor, if we're able to get
22	the dates completed by February
23	THE COURT: The case you're describing a
24	different case or cases than you've got. Okay?
10:03:30 25	MR. DANN: Okay.

1 THE COURT: So. 2. MR. BILLAK: Your Honor, if I --3 THE COURT: All right. I'm sorry. I wanted 4 something, you know, streamlined. It isn't happening. Ι 10:03:40 5 made some suggestions. Yes? MR. WEINBERGER: Peter Weinberger on behalf of 6 7 Plaintiffs Executive Committee. And I did participate in the phone call conference 8 9 that led to the proposal, just to listen in to see what the 10:03:58 10 issues were. 11 On behalf of the PEC, we -- I think it's important for 12 us to state for the record that our abatement remedies that 13 we set forth in our expert reports to abate the public 14 nuisance includes remedies associated with the NAS babies, 10:04:25 15 both with respect to future costs associated with the health 16 care system, related to monitoring their conditions, as well 17 as treating them, as well as abatement remedies in the form 18 of money going towards foster care. 19 And in our discussions with counsel, who are here on 10:04:55 20 behalf of the NAS babies over the last number of months, we 21 have pointed that out to them to reflect the fact that we 22 believe that what we have proposed to abate this public 23 nuisance as relates directly to the clients or the class 2.4 that they purport to represent are within the remedies that 10:05:24 25 we are seeking.

1 THE COURT: Well, thank you. I sort of 2. thought that was the case. So that's another reason why 3 I -- I'm very skeptical of these cases proceeding 4 separately, so. 10:05:40 5 MR. BICKFORD: And, Judge, I think that we 6 both have an issue on that and --7 THE COURT: Well --MR. DANN: Your Honor, I personally -- I 8 9 personally watched the Governor in the legislature take the 10:05:52 10 tobacco settlement money that the state was awarded for 11 cessation of tobacco use and for treatment of people who 12 were injured by tobacco and securitize that and use it to 13 create a tax cut for the people of Ohio on my watch. When I 14 was Attorney General, I saw it happen. 10:06:10 15 The city -- no offense to the politicians, but the 16 cities and the counties and the states in this are not --17 are not in a position to reliably protect the interests of 18 these children as they -- as they grow up. And this court 19 is in a unique position to be able to do that. 10:06:27 20 At a minimum, we'd ask that you remand these cases 21 back to the district courts from whence they came. 22 THE COURT: First of all, I don't have the 23 authority to do it, to just require the JPML. I think 24 they're unmanageable and unworkable. I'm not going to do 10:06:44 25 that. I mean you -- I suggest you go back to the drawing

1 board. You got to convince me or any other court that 2. you're seeking relief different than that relief sought by 3 the cities and counties, Number 1. 4 Number 2, if all you're seeking is medical monitoring, 10:07:03 5 then say that and drop everything else. 6 Number 3, you've got to -- if you want to bring this as a nationwide class action, you've got to show how it's 7 8 manageable, workable. You've got to show how individual, you know, combinations of fact predominate when you've got 10:07:21 10 individual, individual babies who were born of individual 11 mothers, each of whom had a different chain of drug use, and 12 how you're going to prove this or tie this to anyone. 13 You're not a state or a public entity that can sue on 14 behalf of the collective. That's the difference between 10:07:44 15 your case and the other ones I have, the 2000 other ones. 16 So --17 MR. BICKFORD: Judge, with all due respect --18 THE COURT: -- if and when you do all those 19 things and something's in front of me, I'll take a look at 10:07:55 20 it, but at the -- I'm not doing anything with what there is 21 now. 22 MR. BICKFORD: Judge, with all due respect, 23 what we had intended to do was just that. 24 THE COURT: Well, it didn't happen. So you go 10:08:08 25 back to the drawing board. If you have something else you

1	end up presenting, I'll at some point, when I have the time,
2	I'll take a look at it. But I think you should strongly
3	reconsider whether you need to have a separate case or
4	whether the relief that you're you're seeking is
10:08:29 5	already being sought.
6	MR. BICKFORD: Judge, that was the purpose of
7	us, in 30 days, filing our amended complaints and then
8	moving for class certification.
9	THE COURT: Well, you can do whatever you
10:08:43 10	want. Okay?
11	Obviously, you want to amend the complaint, you want
12	to scrap it, you want to go somewhere else, do whatever you
13	want, you know. I I'm not but I'm not issuing any
14	schedule approaching this.
10:08:56 15	So all right. Thank you for everyone's time and
16	attention.
17	(Proceedings adjourned at 10:09 a.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case: 1:17-md-02804-DAP Doc #: 2151 Filed: 08/08/19 20 of 20. PageID #: 288296

C E R T I F I C A T EI certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. s/Shirle Perkins Shirle M. Perkins, RDR, CRR U.S. District Court - Room 7-189 801 West Superior Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 357-7106